



TFW

Form: PTO/SB/17 (Modified)

REPLY/AMENDMENT
FEE TRANSMITTAL

Attorney Docket No.	95-309
Application Number	09/482,956
Filing Date	January 14, 2000
First Named Inventor	KANURI
Group Art Unit	2666
Examiner Name	JAGANNATHAN, Melanie

AMOUNT ENCLOSED \$ 0

FEE CALCULATION (fees effective 10/01/2003)

CLAIMS AS AMENDED	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number Previously Paid For	Number Extra	Rate	Calculations
TOTAL CLAIMS	22	22	0 ⁽³⁾	X \$50.00 =	\$0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS	3	3	0	X \$200.00 =	\$0

Since an Official Action set an original due date of _____, petition is hereby made for an extension to cover the date this reply is filed for which the requisite fee is enclosed (1 month (\$120); 2 months (\$450); 3 months (\$1020); 4 months (\$1,590); 5 months (\$2,160)):

\$0

If Statutory Disclaimer under Rule 20(d) is enclosed, add fee (\$110)

+\$0

Total of above Calculations = \$0

Reduction by 50% for filing by small entity (37 CFR 1.9, 1.27 & 1.28)

-

TOTAL FEES DUE = \$0

- (1) If entry (1) is less than entry (2), entry (3) is "0".
(2) If entry (2) is less than 20, change entry (2) to "20".
(4) If entry (4) is less than entry (5), entry (6) is "0".
(5) If entry (5) is less than 3, change entry (5) to "3".

METHOD OF PAYMENT

- ☐ Check enclosed as payment.
☐ Charge "TOTAL FEES DUE" to the Deposit Account No., below.

AUTHORIZATION

- ☒ If the above-noted "AMOUNT ENCLOSED" is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any additional fees under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 necessary to maintain pendency of the present application to:

Deposit Account No.: 50-0687

OrderNo.: (Client/Matter) 95-309

SUBMITTED BY: MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC

Typed Name	Leon R. Turkevich	Reg. No.	34,035
Signature		Date	January 3, 2006



Docket No.: 95-309

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

KANURI

Serial No.: 09/482,956

Filed: January 14, 2000

:
:
:
:
:
:

Group Art Unit: 2666

Examiner: JAGANNATHAN, Melanie

For: ARRANGEMENT FOR SEARCHING NETWORK ADDRESSES IN A NETWORK
SWITCH USING MULTIPLE TABLES BASED ON SUBNET IDENTIFIER

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Nonfinal Official Action mailed October 3, 2005, Applicant hereby submits the following remarks:

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-22 are unchanged and remain pending in the application.

Applicant traverses the Official Action as improper according to MPEP 707.07(d), which specifies (under the heading "Improperly Expressed Rejections"): "A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group."

In particular, the Office Action asserts that "Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shani US 6,023,563 in view of Brady et al. US 5,914,938." A review

Response Filed January 3, 2006
Appln. No. 09/482,956
Page 1